



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,312	04/24/2007	Javier Salazar Corcuera	21029-00312-US1	8442
30678	7590	06/21/2011	EXAMINER	
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP			BERRY JR, WILLIE WENDELL	
1875 EYE STREET, N.W.			ART UNIT	
SUITE 1100			PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			3652	
			MAIL DATE	
			06/21/2011	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/581,312	CORCUERA, JAVIER SALAZAR
	<b>Examiner</b> WILLIE BERRY JR	Art Unit 3652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2011.
- 2a)  This action is FINAL.      2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4)  Claim(s) 7-13 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 7-9 and 11-13 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:
    1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-941)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-9 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over patent no. 7,419,349 to Goodrich in view of patent no. 4,966,516 to Vartanian.

Regarding claims 7, 11 and 12, Goodrich discloses two rectangular frames (not numbered, but shown in fig. 13) attached by a hinge (not numbered, but shown in fig. 14), a second hinge (not numbered, but shown in fig. 4; note: hinge used to swing wheelchair assembly outside doorframe), a first fixed floor section (34), a moving floor section (36), a cable brake (198), a suspension cable (188) and a hydraulic means for controlling deployment (186 and col. 12, lines 30-35).

Goodrich discloses the claimed invention except for a second fixed and moving floor sections and locking mechanism.

Vartanian discloses that it is known to have a locking mechanism (col. 8, lines 54-63) in a vehicle access ramp.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Goodrich with the teachings of Vartanian for the purpose of providing additional functionality to the ramp.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include second fixed and moving floor sections, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Regarding claim 8, Goodrich discloses guides (52 and 52') and runners (col. 7, lines 1-5).

Goodrich does not disclose a second set of guide and runners.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a second set of guides and runners, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Regarding claim 9, Goodrich discloses a groove (not numbered, but shown in fig. 9) in the guide.

Regarding claim 13, Vartanian discloses a locking mechanism.

Vartanian does not disclose a locking mechanism having a push-rod and cable.

However, the prior art element performs the function specified in the claim in substantially the same manner as the function is performed by the corresponding element described in the specification, and such structure are considered art recognized equivalent structures and would have functioned at least equally as well. It would have been obvious to modify the device in this way for the purpose of providing an alternative arrangement that would have functioned at least equally as well.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-13 filed 3/28/11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIE BERRY JR whose telephone number is (571)272-6191. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 11:30-8pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saul Rodriguez can be reached on (571)272-7097. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 3652

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Saul J. Rodriguez/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 3652

Wbj.